



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,825	12/09/2003	Christian Eickmeier	I/1186-1-C1	4383

28501 7590 03/24/2004

BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM CORPORATION  
900 RIDGEBURY ROAD  
P. O. BOX 368  
RIDGEFIELD, CT 06877

EXAMINER

BERNHARDT, EMILY B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/731,825	EICKMEIER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Emily Bernhardt	1624	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/057,597.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                                    |

Art Unit: 1624

Claims 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Scope of method claims in 3-10 is indeterminate. Defining a disease(s) by its (their) underlying cause renders the scope of intended uses indeterminate since the claim language may read on diseases not yet known to be caused by or affected by such action or in ways not yet understood. Additionally, determining whether a given disease responds or not to sodium-hydrogen exchange inhibition involves much experimentation since a negative response from one patient does not mean the drug isn't useful as no drug has 100% effectiveness. Thus what "success rate" determines if a particular inhibitor is effective and how many patients (and dosage regimens) need to be tested? The test for determining compliance with 35 USC 112, par. two is whether applicants have clearly defined "their" invention not what may be discovered by future research as this type of claim language clearly requires.

Claims 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

Art Unit: 1624

enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Scope of disorders covered by instant method claims appears to cover at least those described on p.5-6 which include whole class of disorders as well as any and all tumor types. The notion that sodium-hydrogen exchange inhibition, the activity relied on herein, is known for such a range of uses is not substantiated by the art provided by the examiner which deals with known drugs having this activity useful for treating myocardial ischaemia and reperfusion injury as well as hypertension. See the medline abstracts provided in parent . Where the utility is unusual or difficult to treat or speculative, the examiner has authority to require evidence that tests relied on are reasonably predictive of in vivo efficacy by those skilled in the art. See for example, In re Ruskin 148 USPQ 221; Ex parte Jovanovics 211 USPQ 907. Any evidence relied on by applicants must clearly show a reasonable expectation of in vivo success for any additional diseases that may still be embraced in response to this action. See MPEP. 2164.05(a).

Note also the criteria for enablement as set out in In re Wands cited in MPEP 2164.01(a), August 2000 edition which considers factors such as:

Art Unit: 1624

1) Breadth of the claims- The claims cover (but are not limited to) to all types of cardiovascular diseases, kidney failure, circulatory disorders of the brain, all cancers, fibrotic diseases, diabetes complications, etc.;

2) Level of skill in this art- the examiner has pointed out above that drugs having the activity relied on herein are not known to have such a spectrum of clinical applications and thus the level of skill is low ;

3) State of the prior art- compounds similar in structure (note Eickmeier or Buerger applied below) have not demonstrated such a range of uses;

4) Working examples- There are no test(s) directed to the many uses pointed out above which are art-recognized for predicting **in vivo** efficacy .

Thus in view of the above the rejection is being applied.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Eickmeier (US'207 or WO'176) and Buerger (US'335 or WO'253). Each of the

Art Unit: 1624

commonly assigned references independently render instant subject matter obvious as they are both drawn to the same basic compounds for the same uses. See col.1 and working examples in Eickmeier and the same as well as claims in Buerger. In particular, in Eickmeier see eg.2 and in Buerger see eg.7. The former differs only in nature of salt form and the latter while a HCl salt as herein has methanesulfonyl in place of trifluoromethyl. Note that both references teaches the interchangeability of various salts as well as trifluoromethyl in place of methanesulfonyl on benzene ring in Buerger. Thus it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the salt of eg.4 with HCl **and** methanesulfonyl of eg.7 with CF<sub>3</sub> and in so doing obtain instant compound for treating one or more uses taught by the applied art.

While evidence of common ownership may now be enough to disqualify commonly assigned art under 103 based on 102(e) as well as 102(f) or (g) in view of the passage of the American Inventors Protection Act, there must be provided a clear statement by applicants, attorney or agent of record that instant application and US'207 and '335 **at the time the instant invention was made** were commonly owned. See 1241 OG 96, December 26,2000. However, WO patent equivalents

Art Unit: 1624

would not be disqualified under this new law. To overcome the rejection with a showing note both prior art compounds mentioned above must be tested against instant HCl salt and any showing be in verified form Note In re Johnson 223 USPQ 1260.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2,3,6,7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,207. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they embrace overlapping subject matter. Instant HCl salt form is generically covered by the claim language.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302).

Commonly assigned 6,323,207, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee is required under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c) to either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made or to name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. Failure to



Art Unit: 1624

comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of the application.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999.

US'335 is limited to methanesulfonyl derivatives.

Claims allowed in parent are directed to hydrated forms not taught by the closest art applied above.

**Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emily Bernhardt whose telephone number is (571) 272-0664.**

**If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the supervisor for AU 1624, Dr. Mukund Shah, can be reached at (571)272-0674.**

**The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.**



**EMILY BERNHARDT**

**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**Group 1600**